

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejection raised in the Office action, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicant does not acquiesce to any portion of the Office Action not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Office noted that claims 1, 3-13 15 and 16 are pending and rejected. Applicants amend claims 1, 4, 9 and 13 and previously canceled claims 2 and 14. Applicant has not introduced any new matter by way of the foregoing amendments.

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicant submits that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101. Thus, Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance.

OBJECTION

The Office objected to claims 1, 4, 9 and 13 for failing failing to provide the proper antecedent bases. Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 9 and 13 to remedy the anomaly.

Furthermore, the Office objected to claim 1 for reciting "diagonally filling said matrix" and indicated that "it's not clear what exactly the Applicant meant to fill diagonally." Applicants direct the Offices attention to the *Specification* of the pending application, for example, pages 11-12, wherein the term is described.

Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 4, 9 and 13.

REJECTION

The Office rejected claims 1, 3-13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In addition, the Office rejected claims 9-12 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,592,553 issued to Guski et al. (hereon after "*Guski*") and claims 1, 3-8 and 13 over U.S. Patent Publication No.

2003/0086564 published to Kuhlman et al. (hereon after "*Kuhlman*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

A. Applicant's Response to the 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection of claims 1-16

Office rejected claims 1, 3-13 and 15-16 for reciting an invention that is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Applicants amend claims 1, 9 and 13 specifically to recite a method processing "in said digital signal processor." Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-16 is respectfully requested.

B. Applicant's Response to the 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

The Office rejected claims 1-8 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Guski*. The Applicant traverses the rejection.

As the Examiner is aware, "anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." *Lindemann Maschinen Fabrick GmbH v. American Hoist Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) [emphasis added]. Applicant submits that the cited reference is devoid from disclosing at least one element recited in Applicant recited invention.

Applicants amend claim 9 to better describe Applicants' inventive concept. Amended claim 9 recites a combination of elements directed to a method of encryption. The combination of elements includes "preprocessing, in said digital signal processor, an input message wherein said preprocessing includes a permutation of said input message and defining a permutation source partitioning said input message into matrix elements, wherein said matrix is a square matrix, and diagonally filling said matrix." [Emphasis added]

Guski "preprocessing, in said digital signal processor, an input message wherein said preprocessing includes a permutation of said input message and defining a permutation source partitioning said input message into matrix elements, wherein said matrix is a square matrix, and diagonally filling said matrix," as recited in claim 9.

The Office rejected claims 1 and 3-8 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Kuhlman*.

Applicants amend claim 1 to better describe Applicants' inventive concept. Amended claim 1 recites a combination of elements directed to a method of encryption. The combination of elements includes "partitioning said input message into matrix elements, wherein said matrix is a square matrix, and diagonally filling said matrix."]Emphasis added]

Kuhlman is devoid of disclosing "partitioning said input message into matrix elements, wherein said matrix is a square matrix, and diagonally filling said matrix," as recited in claim 1. Claim 13 recites similar features as those recited in claim 1.

Given that each of the dependent claims 3-8, 10-12 and 15-16 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 9, each necessarily includes all the elements of its respective independent claim, thus, are not anticipated by *Guski* or *Kuhlman*.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-13 and 15-16.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Office believes that any unresolved issues still exist or if, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite passing the present application to issue, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney directly at 972-917-4365 or the office of the undersigned attorney at 972-917-5651 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 24, 2009

By: /MIRNA ABYAD/
MIRNA ABYAD
Registration No. 58,615
Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Telephone: (972) 917-4365